

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 22-28 are pending in the present application. No claim amendments are presented, thus no new matter is added.

In the Office Action, Claims 22 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Luo et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,216,158, herein Luo) in view of Russell (U.S. Pat. 5,729,220); and Claims 23-24 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Luo in view of Russell and Sudo (EP 0797336).

The Office Action rejects Claims 22 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Luo in view of Russell. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as independent Claim 22 recites novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the applied references.

Independent Claim 22 recites, in part, an information processing system, wherein

... said information processing device includes *a local user interface* configured to receive *a user input local to the information processing device* *selecting a subset of a plurality of item data available at the information processing device as previously set item data* and associate the selected previously set item data with the identification ID of the remote controller, terminal, and

the information processing device is configured to respond to said driving signal and said identification ID by verifying said identification ID has access according to registered ID information, and configured to, if access is permitted, transmit to said remote controller terminal previously set item data corresponding to the received identification ID...

As disclosed in an exemplary embodiment at Figs. 4A-4B and pp. 9-11 of the specification, the subset of item data transmitted to the remote controller terminal is selected using a user interface of the information processing device. The selected subset of data items is associated with the remote controller terminal, so that when the remote controller terminal requests control of the information processing device, only the previously set subset of data

items (representing a subset of the data items available at the information processing device) are transmitted to the remote controller terminal.

In rejecting the claimed features directed to the a local user interface at the information processing device “configured to receive a user input local to the information processing device *selecting a subset of a plurality of item data available at the information processing device as previously set item data*”, p. 3 of the Office Action appears to concede that Luo fails to disclose this claimed feature, and instead relies on Russell, asserting that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the cited references to arrive at Applicant’s claims. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as Russell fails to teach or suggest the claimed features for which it is relied upon as a secondary reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

In rejecting the above noted feature recited in independent Claim 22, the Office Action relies on col. 16, ll. 40-65 of Russell, noting “system or security admin. inputting at the processing device.” More particularly, this cited portion of Russell describes a process of defining all enterprise resources to a core security system and access/authority levels of these system resources. Then, all users are defined in the security system to provide a system accessible only to authorized devices. Russell then describes that his system includes the features of 1) an access-seeking user which must access user/computer interface device 10 with a password; and 2) after a satisfactory user access, the device 10 then transmits its own composite annunciation signal; and 3) distributed or centralized security logic authenticates that specific input device’s 10 annunciation signal and allows only access authorized to that specific device 10 and that specific user.

This cited portion of Russell, therefore, merely describes the creation of an authentication procedure for authenticating the device 10 (e.g. interrogator) to remotely access and operate one of the devices in a network. As described at col. 16, ll. 12-23, the

only input that an “admin.” appears to have in Russell is to set “access privileges” that determines a devices 10 “level of access” over the entire system by a system administrator.

Russell, therefore, fails to teach or suggest that the information processing device that is controlled includes an interface configured to receive “a user input *local to the information processing device*”, and that the input includes the selection of “*a subset of a plurality of item data available at the information processing device as previously set item data*”, as recited in independent Claim 22. Instead, Russell describes a system-wide security architecture that does not appear to be determined by an input at the device that is to be controlled by the remote control device 10. Moreover, Russell fails to disclose that the security is set in such a way that a particular *subset of a plurality of data items* is associated with a specific ID of the remote control device 10, but instead describes that the system is based on defined “levels of access” for each of the devices.

Therefore, Luo, even if combined with Russell, fails to teach or suggest an information processing system, wherein the information processing device that is to be controlled “includes *a local user interface* configured to receive a user input *local to the information processing device selecting a subset of a plurality of item data available at the information processing device as previously set item data* and associate the selected previously set item data with the identification ID of the remote controller terminal and ... if access is permitted, transmit to said remote controller terminal previously set item data corresponding to the received identification ID...” as recited in independent Claim 22.

Further, Sudo fails to cure any of the above noted deficiencies of Luo and Russell. Therefore, Luo, Russell, and Sudo do not teach or suggest each and every element of independent Claim 22, and it is respectfully submitted that Claim 22 (and Claims 23-28 dependent therefrom) is patentable over Luo, Russell, and Sudo.

Consequently, in view of the present Amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 22-28 is patentably distinguishing over the applied references. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of the application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Bradley D. Lytle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)

Andrew T. Harry  
Registration No. 56,959

I:\VATTY\ATH\PROSECUTION\21s\212667US\212667US - RR DUE 03-01-09.DOC